13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1		
2	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
3	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
4		
5		
6	RONALD JAMES BARBIERI,	No. C 12-06311 WHA
7	Plaintiff,	
8	v.	ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE RE DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO DISMISS
9	STEVEN FREITAS, SONOMA COUNTY	
10	SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT, KATHRYN STRALEY, and DOES 1-15,	
11	Defendants.	
10		

On January 9, 20130, defendants filed a motion to dismiss pro se plaintiff Ronald James's complaint. Pursuant to Local Rule 7-3, plaintiff's response was due seventeen days thereafter, because service was via United States mail. That deadline has passed and no response has been received. Plaintiff is hereby **ORDERED TO SHOW CAUSE** why the motion to dismiss should not be granted, particularly in light of the fact that the related action, Barbieri v. PWFG Reo Owner, LLC et al., No. 12-5252-WHA, was dismissed for failure to prosecute and judgment was entered against plaintiff.

Plaintiff's response is due by **FEBRUARY 8 AT NOON**. Plaintiff is warned that failure to timely respond may result in the motion to dismiss being granted or the action being dismissed for failure to prosecute. The hearing currently scheduled for February 21 shall remain on calendar.

## IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: January 31, 2013.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE